

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,276	11/24/1999	YUN BOK LEE	8733.20024	4858
7590 03/14/2002 LONG ALDRIDGE & NORMAN LLP		EXAMINER		
701 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			EXAMINER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004		•	RUDE, TIMOTHY L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

र्ग कु						
<b>3</b> 1	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/448,276	LEE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Timothy L Rude	2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	rrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day by will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2⁴	1 November 1000					
,— ·	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		osecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application	on.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	rawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11,14,17-38</u> is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12,13,15 and 16</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
	ian priority under 35 LLS C & 119/a	\_(d) or (f)				
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
· _ '	nts have been received					
<ul> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> </ul>						
Copies of the certified copies of the prapplication from the International E	iority documents have been receive Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ed in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	•					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachment(s)	<b>-</b>	/				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.7.8. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:						
S. Patent and Trademark Office		<del></del>				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01)

Art Unit: 2871

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 14, 17-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA) in view of Yamada et al (Yamada) USPAT 6,344,883.

As to claim 1, APA discloses in Figure 1 and in the description of the related art, a multi-domain liquid crystal display device comprising: first and second substrates facing each other; a liquid crystal layer between said first and second substrates; a plurality of gate bus lines arranged in a first direction on said first substrate and a plurality of data bus lines arranged in a second direction on said first substrate to define a pixel region; a pixel electrode in said pixel region; and a common electrode on said second substrate.

APA does not explicitly disclose a dielectric frame in a region other than a region where said pixel electrode is formed, a dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to

Art Unit: 2871

said liquid crystal layer, and an alignment layer on at least one substrate between said first and second substrates.

Yamada discloses in Figures 10A-10D (col. 19, line 40 through col. 27, line 35) a dielectric frame, 36, (OMR83, col. 26, lines 45-62) in a region other than a region where said pixel (pixel region in 10C) electrode is formed, said dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to said liquid crystal layer (inherent to dielectric material, OMR83), and an alignment layer, 38a and 38b, on at least one substrate between said first and second substrates.

Yamada is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to add a dielectric frame to the LCD of APA to avoid a rough display in gray scales (col. 13, lines 36-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the LCD of APA with the Dielectric frame of Yamada.

As to claim 2, APA discloses in Figure 1 a gate insulator over said whole first substrate (not shown); a passivation layer, 37, on said gate insulator over said whole first substrate; and a light shielding layer, 25, on said second substrate, and a color filter layer, 23, on said light shielding layer.

APA does not explicitly disclose an over coat layer on said color filter layer.

Yamada discloses (col. 32, lines 22-60) a color filter layer and an over coat layer, 90a, on said color filter layer.

Art Unit: 2871

Yamada is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to add an over coat layer on said color filter layer to provide a color display with good control of LC alignment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the LCD of APA with the over coat layer of Yamada.

As to claim 3, Yamada discloses (col. 26, lines 45-62) a dielectric frame made from resist material OMR83 wherein said dielectric frame is therefore patterned.

As to claim 4, Yamada discloses in Figures 12A and 12B (col. 25, lines 25-39) a dielectric frame that maintains uniformly gap between said first and second substrates by supporting the spacers, 65.

As to claim 5, Yamada discloses (col. 26, lines 45-62) a dielectric frame made from resist material OMR83 wherein the dielectric constant of said dielectric frame is therefore different than that of said liquid crystal layer.

As to claim 7, Yamada discloses (col. 26, lines 45-62) a dielectric frame including photosensitive materials (OMR83).

Art Unit: 2871

As to claims 11 and 14, Yamada discloses in Figures 10A-10D (col. 19, line 40 through col. 27, line 35) the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein said pixel electrode (col. 20, lines 5-9) has an electric field inducing window, 35, inside of itself.

As to claim 17, Yamada discloses the use of polyimide-type materials for the homeotropic alignment layer (Applicant's passivation layer).

As to claim 18, APA in view of Yamada does not explicitly disclose a passivation layer of a material selected from the group consisting of silicon nitride and silicon oxide. However, the use of these materials for a passivation layer is well known in the art of liquid crystals and is therefore and obvious expedient.

As to claims 19 and 20, Yamada discloses the use of pixel and common electrodes made of ITO (col. 25, lines 25-32).

As to claim 21, Yamada discloses in Figures 10A-10D (col. 19, line 40 through col. 27, line 35) the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein said pixel region is divided into at least two portions (Figure 10D), liquid crystal molecules in said liquid crystal layer in each portion being driven differently from each other.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claim 22, Yamada discloses in Figure 10B and as prior art in Figure 30B a multi-domain liquid crystal display device wherein the alignment layer is divided into at least two portions, liquid crystal molecules in said liquid crystal layer in each portion being aligned differently from each other.

As to claim 23, Yamada discloses as prior art (col. 2, lines 63-67) a multi-domain liquid crystal display device wherein at least one portion of said alignment layer is alignment-treated.

As to claim 24, Yamada discloses as prior art (col. 2, lines 53-57) a multi-domain liquid crystal display device wherein all portions of said alignment layer are non-alignment-treated.

As to claim 25, Yamada discloses as prior art the use of a liquid crystal layer including liquid crystal molecules having positive dielectric anisotropy (col. 2, lines 22-47).

As to claim 26, Yamada discloses (col. 6, lines 56-64) the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 1, wherein said liquid crystal layer includes liquid crystal molecules having negative dielectric anisotropy.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claim 27, Yamada discloses (col. 17, lines 47-50) a negative uniaxial film on at least one substrate.

As to claim 28, Yamada discloses (col. 17, lines 50-58) a negative biaxial film on at least one substrate.

As to claim 29, Yamada discloses (col. 26, line 65 through col. 27, line 7) the use of a liquid crystal layer including chiral dopants.

As to claim 30, APA discloses in Figure 1 and in the description of the related art, a multi-domain liquid crystal display device comprising: first and second substrates facing each other; a liquid crystal layer between said first and second substrates; a plurality of gate bus lines arranged in a first direction on said first substrate and a plurality of data bus lines arranged in a second direction on said first substrate to define a pixel region; a pixel electrode in said pixel region; and a common electrode on said second substrate.

APA does not explicitly disclose a dielectric frame surrounding said pixel region, said dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to said liquid crystal layer; and an alignment layer on at least one substrate between said first and second substrates.

Yamada discloses in Figures 10A-10D (col. 19, line 40 through col. 27, line 35) a dielectric frame, 36, (OMR83, col. 26, lines 45-62) surrounding said pixel region (Figure 10C), said dielectric frame distorting electric field applied to said liquid crystal layer; and

Art Unit: 2871

an alignment layer, 38a and 38b, on at least one substrate between said first and second substrates.

Yamada is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to add a dielectric frame to the LCD of APA to avoid a rough display in gray scales (col. 13, lines 36-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the LCD of APA with the Dielectric frame of Yamada.

As to claim 31, APA discloses in Figure 1 a gate insulator over said whole first substrate (not shown); a passivation layer, 37, on said gate insulator over said whole first substrate; and a light shielding layer, 25, on said second substrate, and a color filter layer, 23, on said light shielding layer.

APA does not explicitly disclose an over coat layer on said color filter layer.

Yamada discloses (col. 32, lines 22-60) a color filter layer and an over coat layer, 90a, on said color filter layer.

Yamada is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to add an over coat layer on said color filter layer to provide a color display with good control of LC alignment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the LCD of APA with the over coat layer of Yamada.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claim 32, Yamada discloses (col. 26, lines 45-62) a dielectric frame made from resist material OMR83 wherein said dielectric frame is therefore patterned.

As to claim 33, Yamada discloses (col. 26, lines 45-62) a dielectric frame made from resist material OMR83 wherein the dielectric constant of said dielectric frame is therefore different than that of said liquid crystal layer.

As to claim 35, Yamada discloses (col. 26, lines 45-62) a dielectric frame including photosensitive materials (OMR83).

2. Claims 6, 8-10, 34, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA) in view of Yamada, and further in view of Horie et al (Horie) USPAT 6,061,117.

As to claim 6 and 34, APA in view of Yamada does not explicitly disclose the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claims 1 and 30 respectively, wherein said dielectric frame shields light leakage from a region other than said pixel region.

Horie teaches (col. 7, lines 4-15) the use of a black dye in the dielectric frame to provide light shielding.

Art Unit: 2871

Horie is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to add a black dye to provide a light shielding property to the dielectric frames.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the LCD of APA in view of Yamada with the light shielding frames of Horie.

As to claim 8 and 36, APA in view of Yamada does not explicitly disclose the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claims 1 and 30 respectively, wherein said dielectric frame includes a material selected from the group consisting of BCB (BenzoCycloButene) and photoacrylate.

Horie teaches (col. 18, lines 5-32) the use of photocurable resins including acrylic acid and acrylates having a long-chain alkyl group with three or more carbon atoms or having a benzene ring.

Horie is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to use photoacrylate to facilitate easy fabrication of the frame.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the LCD of APA in view of Yamada with the photoacrylate of Horie.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claims 9 and 37, APA in view of Yamada does not explicitly disclose the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claims 1 and 30 respectively, wherein said dielectric frame includes mixture of polyimide and carbon black.

Horie teaches (col. 15, lines 38-50) the use of polyimide for the frame (convex portion) and Horie teaches the use of a black dye (col. 7, lines 4-15).

Horie does not explicitly disclose the use of carbon black as the dye. However, the use of carbon black as a dye for light shields is well known in the art of liquid crystals.

Horie is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to add a black dye of carbon black to provide a light shielding property to the dielectric frames.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the LCD of APA in view of Yamada with the carbon black dyed light shielding frames of Horie.

As to claims 10 and 38, Yamada discloses the use of acrylic resin (acrylic negative resist, col. 35, lines 2-10) for the dielectric frame. Horie discloses the use of a black dye in the frame for light shielding (col. 7, lines 4-15).

APA in view of Yamada does not explicitly disclose the use of carbon black as the dye. However, the use of carbon black as a dye for light shields is well known in the art of liquid crystals.

Application/Control Number: 09/448,276 Page 12

Art Unit: 2871

Horie is evidence that ordinary workers in the art of liquid crystals would find the reason, suggestion, or motivation to add a black dye of carbon black to provide a light shielding property to the dielectric frames.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify the acrylic LCD frames of APA in view of Yamada with the carbon black dye of Horie.

Art Unit: 2871

## Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As to claim 12, a search of relevant prior art did not disclose alone or in combination the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 2, wherein said passivation layer has an electric field inducing window inside of itself.

As to claim 13, a search of relevant prior art did not disclose alone or in combination the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 2, wherein said gate insulator has an electric field inducing window inside of itself.

As to claim 15, a search of relevant prior art did not disclose alone or in combination the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 2, wherein said color filter layer has an electric field inducing window inside of itself.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claim 16, a search of relevant prior art did not disclose alone or in combination the multi-domain liquid crystal display device according to claim 2, wherein said over coat layer has an electric field inducing window inside of itself.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy L Rude whose telephone number is (703) 305-0418. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William L Sikes can be reached on (703) 308-4842. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7724 for regular communications and (703) 308-7725 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

Timothy L Rude Examiner

Art Unit 2871

TLR March 4, 2002

The Rule

William L. Sikes

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800

ellan I Sike